DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 414 HE 013 93[illegible]

TITLE	Educational Cooperation in the City. Volume 3, No. 1.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C. Urban College and University Network.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Mar 81
NOTE	10p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Urban College and University Network, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.
JOURNAL CIT	Connections; v3 n1 Mar 1981
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Community Education; Community Involvement; Community Organizations; *Consortia; Cultural Activities; Engineering; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Industry; Inner City; Intercollegiate Cooperation; Lifelong Learning; Minority Groups; Private Colleges; Program Costs; *School Business Relationship; *School Community Programs; State Colleges; Student Teachers; Teacher Education; *Urban Areas; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	New Jersey (Jersey City); New York (New York); Oklahoma (Oklahoma City); Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

Cooperative relationships among urban colleges and universities and their educational collaboration with governmental, cultural, and business institutions in the city are addressed. An article by Larry Rose suggests that institutional self-interest plays a central role in encouraging educational collaboration. Four programs are described that help to indicate why city institutions are cooperating as well as what it takes to make that cooperation work. PRIME, an acronym for Philadelphia Regional Introduction for Minorities in Engineering, is a successful collaboration between 33 local industries and government agencies, the Philadelphia and Camden public schools, and four universities. This consortium manages institutional relationships through an autonomous coordinating unit. BECA, the Brooklyn Educational and Cultural Alliance, is a consortium of the borough's five independent postsecondary institutions and five of its major cultural organizations. This consortium also has a coordinating unit separate from the participating institutions. In Jersey City, the Jersey City State College and the public schools cooperated in establishing the Alternative Teacher Training Program (ATTP), a five-semester, totally field-based, preservice training program in the inner city elementary schools. The chief differences between ATTP and the college's traditional program are the amount of time students spend interning, the curricular emphasis on understanding the needs of inner city children, and the use of a variety of teaching strategies. Oklahoma City's Community Education Consortium for Lifelong Learning is confronted by the critical issues of financing, community participation, and organizational structure. There is a widely-held view that the programs of the consortium are geared to high school students rather than community residents, since most of the programs are sponsored by the school district. (SW)

ED202414

MARCH 1981 VOLUME 3, No. 1 URBAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY NETWORK

CONNECTIONS

EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE CITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 013 936

March 1981 Vol. 3, No. 1 Urban College and University Network

connections

In this issue, Connections turns its attention to cooperative relationships among urban colleges and universities and their educational collaboration with governmental, cultural, and business institutions in the city.

Connections has called upon Larry Rose, President of the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, to help explain why urban colleges and universities are entering into cooperative relationships. Rose suggests that institutional self-interest plays a central role in encouraging educational collaboration.

The four programs reported on in *Connections* aid in understanding why city institutions are cooperating as well as what it takes to make cooperation work. In Philadelphia, PRIME is an educational consortium which manages institutional relationships by means of an autonomous coordinating unit. An additional source of PRIME's accomplishments is the successful inclusion of private enterprise in its affairs. With federal monies diminishing, PRIME's ability to tap the resources of the business sector deserves attention.

In Brooklyn, BECA is another educational consortium with a coordinating unit separate from the participating institutions. BECA's achievements can be attributed to its ability to involve community organizations in its operation and win their confidence. In Jersey City, a state college and a public school system are thrust together in a collaborative effort without the benefit of an autonomous unit to structure their relationship. And in Oklahoma City, an educational consortium is confronted by the critical issues of financing, community participation, and organizational structure which all collaborative ventures in the city must face.

Although considerable attention is paid in this issue of *Connections* to educational collaboration motivated by institutional self-interest, it should not be forgotten that these urban enterprises cooperate because they share a similar purpose, which is to better serve the educational needs of the city's residents. ■

EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE CITY

Also in this issue:

- **Public-Private Collaboration**
- **Educational And Cultural Alliance**
- **Public School And State College Work Together**
- **Challenges To A New Consortium**

There are still a few yellow ribbons left dangling from trees and telephone poles here in Kansas City. They remind me of the fragility of nation-state relationships, and that cooperation in international affairs is an idea whose time has only partly come. That seems to be true of many other areas of life as well.

I make my living helping colleges and universities cooperate with one another. My academic consortium, the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE), is part of a relatively new movement in higher education, a movement that takes as its premise the notion that there are some things colleges can do better together than they can do separately.

Here in Kansas City, we help institutions work together whenever that will save them money or improve educational quality. Cooperation is promoted not only among colleges and universities, but also between those institutions and a variety of cultural, social, business, and political organizations in the city.

WHY COOPERATE?

The most logical reason for cooperating is that it is often in the institution's self-interest to do so. These days, as a result of fiscal constraints and tight budgets, colleges and universities need students. They can get more students if they serve them better, and cooperation is often a cost-effective, low-risk way of providing better student service. Thus, in the immediate future there may very well be more interinstitutional cooperation which will attract larger numbers of students through better educational service.

Cooperation in urban education is compelling for another reason. Sometimes, community agencies and institutions of higher education are better able to cooperate with a group of institutions of higher education than with a single institution.

For example, the Kansas City Philharmonic works with the Regional Council to provide workshops for instrumental students from our 17 campuses. That same organization would not and could not mount such a program for a single institu-

Larry L. Rose is President of the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, a voluntary, academic consortium of 17 colleges and universities in the Kansas City area. He directs a task force on "Theories of Cooperation" for the Council for Interinstitutional Leadership. He taught philosophy at two undergraduate institutions before coming to the Regional Council as its Vice-President in 1972.

tion. It would not be financially feasible and would open the Philharmonic to many requests for duplication of those same services.

A further rationale for colleges and community agencies working together is that they are more likely to have the trust of student clienteles they want to serve. There is not only strength in numbers, there is also integrity. KCRCHE's work in the community, through a variety of programs, is often accepted in large part because we represent the interests and the resources of many institutions. Our "College Information Service" is publicized by area media and used by area residents simply because it is viewed as neutrally based and genuinely student oriented.

The argument for collaboration is especially strong when institutions of higher education and other city based organizations are working in geographical proximity, serving similar clienteles, often with similar programs, and seeking better access to and use of community resources.

MAKING COOPERATION WORK

In spite of a clear rationale, making interinstitutional cooperation work is somewhat harder than getting agreement about the idea. Here are a few suggestions about how to overcome some of the operational difficulties:

The standard advice about getting a mandate from the President is as often wrong as right, especially on this issue. There is some evidence that institutional middle-managers are more likely than the chief executive officer to engage in cooperative relationships. This may be because their primary aim is to get the job done, and they have less concern about territory and institutional prestige than do those to whom they report. It may be a good idea to leave the CEO out of the picture until it is time to take credit.

It is strategically sound to start a discussion of cooperation by showing how the proposed cooperative project will benefit the institution being asked to participate—and *then* move on to the ways in which the project will serve students and the community. This point about institutional self-interest must be qualified with the allowance that people are *also* altruistic, although often for self-interested reasons of which they are unaware. Thus the organizer of interinstitutional cooperation should describe the greater good that will come of the project and allow participants to take pride in their prospective service to students. In a few cases, the shrewd organizer will discern that community service, even at the expense of institutional profit, is in fact the motivating force for a participant in the discussion, a fact that must then be recognized and reinforced.

"Cooperative projects have no constituency, are outside the normal rewards system, and therefore must be staffed, not shoestringed!"

There is no such thing as a free program. Someone has to pay, in time and/or money. Cooperative projects that depend for their manpower on the overtime efforts of already overworked professionals will not succeed. Programs must be staffed by new people or through released time; and if program responsibilities are made part of the job descriptions of regular personnel, then they must be in place of, not in addition to, responsibilities that were there before. Cooperative projects have no constituency, are outside the normal rewards system, and therefore must be staffed, not shoestringed!

Peer esteem problems, among and between institutions, must also be considered. Generally, they are best faced openly since, upon careful inspection, they are usually the products more of prejudice than of fact. The "major urban university" must be disabused of its notion that its people are "better" than those of the other participating institutions, and that those differences will inhibit the success of the project. They will, only if the myth is allowed to stand unchallenged.

"Cost-effectiveness is a slender reed. Do not try to climb too high on it."

The measurable cost-effectiveness of a cooperative approach to a specific program is a factor to be exploited as fully as possible. Yet if such a calculus is relied on as the sole rationale for cooperation, the numbers will not be persuasive. Rather, it is often the unmeasurable, yet clearly real service to students that is the most effective argument for cooperation. Cost-effectiveness is a slender reed. Do not try to climb too high on it.

A CHALLENGE

Educational collaboration in the city, like international coopération, is fragile, requires hard work, and flies in face of man's non-cooperative nature. Yet cooperative relationships among urban institutions exist. Such relationships serve students better and serve the interests of the participating institutions as well.

The real possibilities of educational collaboration should encourage us to break free of our habit of unilateral action and adopt a cooperative approach which will best serve the educational needs of our students. ■

Philadelphia
PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION FOR MINORITY ENGINEERS

PRIME, the acronym for Philadelphia Regional Introduction for Minorities to Engineering, is a successful collaboration between 33 local industries and government agencies, the Philadelphia and Camden public schools, and four universities.

Not the least reason for its success is that it answers the indelicate, but very real question that collaborators must ask: "What's in it for me?"

There are other more important reasons why the six-year-old program works well, but, asserts PRIME Director W. Barry McLaughlin, "In any collaboration, the participants, as vested interest groups have to have a stake in the project and something to gain."

Barry heads a five-person staff that administers the far-flung program, this year involving 2,200 students in 37 junior and senior high schools. The staff reports to a board of directors that includes representatives from the community as well as members of the consortium. The independent staff, with no ties or obligations to any single interest group, is critical to effective interinstitutional cooperation, says Barry.

As the name implies, PRIME's goal is to encourage qualified minority students in area schools to consider engineering as a career. The objective is to increase the number of minority engineers ten-fold in 10 years. Although this will be difficult to achieve, McLaughlin feels that the program is well on its way. Of the 239 students in the June 1980 PRIME graduating class, 140 were accepted into engineering and technical schools and 36 were enrolled in science programs, such as physics or chemistry.

PRIME students are selected in the 7th grade by counselors and science, mathematics, and communications teachers. Their introduction to the program is a series of field trips. Classroom work starts in the 8th grade with weekly, team taught, back-to-back periods of science and mathematics. The courses were specially developed for the program by PRIME with assistance from the participating universities and the public schools. Junior high school faculty in the program—called PRIME teachers—attend summer workshops to become familiar with the course work.

In the senior high schools, there are two 9th grade engineering classes and one 12th grade advanced science course. The remainder of the senior high program consists of up to five 45-minute tutoring sessions each week where students are given new science materials and work on science projects, such as building a robot. Next year, as a result of a budget reduction, the senior high school academic work will be dropped and replaced by motivational counseling. PRIME students will meet with PRIME counselors six times a year on college campuses to ensure they are taking the proper courses for college entrance and have signed up for pre-college examinations.

Each junior or senior high school in the program has a business or government agency partner operating in some field of engineering. The partners provide minority role models as counselors and classroom speakers and host field trips to plants and offices. PRIME graduates who have been accepted in postsecondary engineering or technical programs know they can have a summer job with one of the partners, if they want it. The partners also contribute in-kind services to the program that include materials for engineering projects.

Some companies go further. Aubrey Jones, who represents Sperry-Univac at Leeds middle school, put together a computer instructional course that has some 7th and 8th graders moving ahead of their teachers in computer knowledge. First he convinced the Tandy Corporation to loan the school 11 TRS 80 self-contained computers. After he designed the course, he trained two Leeds teachers to supervise it. Sperry-Univac has furnished Jones with the support services needed for the development of the computer program.

The crown jewel of PRIME activities is the PRIME University Program (PUP). It offers 80 of its most promising students one month of academic work at the consortium universities each summer from the 8th through the 12th grade. PUP gives the parent program year around continuity and helps sustain student interest and motivation. The students spend four to five hours a day working in a carefully planned, progressively sophisticated curricula in mathematics, communications, computers, and engineering. The courses are taught by professors from the participating universities and specially trained public school teachers.

Students are nominated to PUP by teachers and principals based on the students' California Achievement Test scores, coursework and their personal interests. Each school is allotted three slots. The final selection is made after interviews by a team from the school's company or government partner. Last year slightly more than half of the PUP students were females, 81 percent were black or Hispanic, and 15 percent were white.

The first PUP summer is spent on campus at Temple University; the next year is at the University of Pennsylvania; the third summer is at Drexel University; and the final year is spent in residence at Villanova University. Each summer one component of the core curricula is stressed, although all are offered. Engineering design receives particular attention during the summer at Villanova University. Students work in teams, and their past projects have been imaginative: a portable traffic light, a communication system for the deaf, and a concealed portable radio for a bicycle. Because the universities waive their normal overhead charges, PRIME estimates the cost of PUP at about $3.50 per student per hour.

Reflecting on the elements that hold a diverse consortium together and make it productive, McLaughlin talked about concrete goals, clearly defined partnership roles, and a committed, active board of directors.

At PRIME there is no overlap in the work plan. The educators are responsible for the curriculum review and development, industry contributes the resources and new technology, and the public school system provides the teachers.

McLaughlin feels that PRIME has wisely kept its objectives narrow enough to be manageble, and real enough to be achieveable. It has not, for example, addressed itself to the larger problem of deteriorating science education in the inner city schools.

For members of the consortium board, McLaughlin would naturally prefer corporate vice presidents, but whatever the title he wants "movers and shakers" of cor-

porate resources with a strong interest and commitment. Aubrey Jones, for example, is not a vice president, but he is an energetic self-starter whose project attracted support from the executive suite.

Everyone involved, from board members on down, says McLaughlin, should have obligations that require work. "Taking part breeds a sense of competency and collegiality which reinforces the momentum of the consortium," he said. "The members must have a sense of doing."

Financially, PRIME has arrived at a turning point. Its largest supporter, the Sloan Foundation, has phased out of the program. The bulk of funding for the $260,000 annual budget now comes from business and industry, where the competition for contributed dollars is tough. Government agencies can only contribute in-kind services.

One of the affiliated companies, the Electric Transmission and Distribution Division of Philadelphia Electric, pays $3,000 annual dues, plus a contribution to the summer program. The company's PRIME representative, Vice President William Maruchi is enthusiastic about the program, and indicated the company would not support it if it were not a good investment. He said programs are carefully scrutinized before the company will commit funds. "We are dollar guys," says Maruchi, "and a dollar is a dollar."

McLaughlin welcomes the scrutiny of the budget-minded business people who traditionally put the lion's share of their contributions to education into postsecondary institutions. A part of his mission is to point out the need for business to invest in precollege education. "At an overall cost of $2.40 per student per day," he says, "They are getting a good return on their dollar."

PRIME has turned out to be a good investment for all of the consortium partners. The private industries and government agencies need to fill jobs in the future. The public schools get an improved science curriculum, better teaching, and new educational opportunities for their students. The universities tap the pool of minority science students with far greater success than they could with separate, competing programs. The students get first-rate preparation and guidance for a career many would not have considered or thought possible.

Contact:
W. Barry McLaughlin
Director, PRIME
260 South Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102
(215) 735-0872 ■

Brooklyn
A CONSORTIUM SPURS NEIGHBORHOOD RENAISSANCE

BECA, The Brooklyn Educational and Cultural Alliance, is a consortium of the borough's five independent postsecondary institutions and five of its major cultural organizations. In just a few years it has become an important force in the Brooklyn renaissance, opening up the consortium's varied list of 200 programs to Brooklyn's heterogeneous collection of community organizations. It has gained prominence and respect in the community, and is responsible for a new burst of Brooklyn pride.

BECA's fast rise is due mainly to the three ingredients regarded as indispensable to a cooperative project of its size—autonomy, money, and the active participation of neighborhood organizations. It is managed by a small staff, with a 10 member board of directors representing the consortium. It operates independently, but closely with, both the consortium members and its clients in the community. It has been successful in getting funding from several sources and has created a unique voucher plan which simplified the money handling process of its major community-wide program.

BECA was chartered in 1975 by the New York State Board of Regents. It was created to develop and support programs that have a positive effect on the social, economic, and environmental life of the borough. BECA has declared itself a partner in the community's efforts to adjust to the change that has followed the flow of culturally diverse people into Brooklyn since the 17th century. It is a natural agency for confronting and solving the mutual problems of its members.

The Voucher Program was introduced in 1978 with a $36,000 grant from the New York State Legislature for a pilot program. The 1979-80 grant was nearly doubled and this year the grant was $90,000. The Voucher Program resembles the federal food stamp program. It has a payment-purchase mechanism that enables community organizations to pay consortium members for programs or other services. No money changes hands. The transfer of funds is a bookkeeping process, and at the end of the year the consortium institutions receive a lump sum from BECA for the services they have provided the community groups.

Any of the approximately 1,500 Brooklyn neighborhood organizations may apply for voucher grants. They fill out a 21-item questionnaire that profiles the organization. The grantees are selected by an advisory committee representing the neighborhood organizations and the consortium members. This selection process exempts the BECA staff from any possible charges of favoritism. Thirty-five community organizations are awarded voucher grants each year and some get renewed grants. Until this year each received an equal share of the money pie. In 1980, the share was $3,000. Now BECA is experimenting with variable shares of $1,500, especially for senior citizen groups whose programs generally cost less.

Additional funds from the Ford Foundation and BECA have been targeted into block voucher grants of $10,000 for the Sunset Park and Kensington neighborhoods. These block grants will allow the communities themselves to define specific problems and start the process of amelioration. Sunset Park is focusing on environmental concerns and will establish a recycling center, and Kensington has begun work on a cultural and educational center to lend strength to the neighborhood.

After the awards are announced, BECA holds a two-day workshop to explain the voucher system to grantees. The workshop also gives the BECA staff an opportunity to get acquainted with the neighborhood groups and to introduce the groups to the liaison officer from the BECA institution where they will be spending their voucher grant.

Not all community organizations choose a ready-made program (from Artisan Skills to Visual Arts) listed in the BECA Resource Directory. Often programs are tailored to special needs. For example, the Brooklyn Public Library staff helped the Sunset Park Restoration Community to produce a slide/sound show on the history and rejuvenation of the neighborhood. One audience for the film is the Sunset Park public school

BECA Institutions

Brooklyn Academy of Music
Brooklyn Botanic Garden
Brooklyn Museum
Brooklyn Public Library
Long Island University (Brooklyn Center)
Polytechnic Institute of New York
Pratt Institute
St. Francis College
St. Joseph's College
Long Island Historical Society
(Associate Member)

children. It is hoped that it will help them to better understand and take pride in their neighborhood.

In 1980 there were 250 BECA programs spread around Brooklyn, attended by nearly 100,000 borough residents. The names of some voucher award winners offer a clue to the variety of the participating neighborhood groups: China Town Planning Council, Little People's Learning Center, The Metropolitan Widowed Persons Service, Neustros Ninos Day Care Center.

In addition to its showcase Voucher Program, BECA manages six other cooperative projects which address specific community interests.

"Brooklyn Rediscovery" is an interdisciplinary humanities program that explores the community's substantive contributions to national life. The multi-media format includes a college credit course, lectures, walking tours, publications, and films. Major funding comes from the National Endowment for the Humanities, with additional support from local foundations and businesses.

"BECA/BAM Theatre Company" in cooperation with The Brooklyn Academy of Music provides lectures, mini-performances, seminars, and workshops for 2,000 students from five high schools and 14,000 undergraduate students in BECA institutions.

Other programs include a feasibility study to strengthen cultural education in secondary schools; an evaluation of the quality and quantity of news media coverage of the borough; and a program providing educational, occupational, and psychological developmental skills for "battered" women.

BECA was started partially with the hope that it would produce income for the institutions in the consortium. Although that has not happened to the extent envisioned, it has not weakened the program. Howard E. Hornstein, BECA's executive director, says that one reason for its success is that the members have sublimated some of their individual ambitions. They understand, he says, that their future is in Brooklyn and that they will not advance unless the city does.

BECA is helping Brooklyn deal with a long-time irritation caused by living in the shadow of the more glamorous and powerful Manhattan. "The only time you read about Brooklyn in the press is when someone in Canarsie shoots both his parents," said one BECA staff member. The Manhattan mind-set that New York stops at the Brooklyn Bridge fuels the cooperative spirit among Brooklynites, and BECA is there to help give it substance.

After its exhibition of works by neighborhood artists, the Society for Clinton Hill reported to BECA: "The exhibition was attended by more than 1,000 people. It gave our community a new pride in itself and we hope to make this project an annual event."

The Shore Hill Housing Company, a senior citizen community, used a part of its voucher to sponsor a lecture on Brooklyn baseball by a staff member of the Long Island Historical Society. "Well attended and a delight" was the comment from the elders, adding that the evening spun on with the audience and the speaker trading reminiscences about the glorious days when the Dodgers belonged to Brooklyn.

Contact:
Howard B. Hornstein
Executive Director, BECA
26 Court Street
Suite 2701
Brooklyn, New York 11242
(212) 852-4400

Jersey City

STATE COLLEGE AND SCHOOL SYSTEM TRAIN TEACHERS FOR INNER CITY

For teachers educated in traditional state college programs, going to work in the unaccustomed culture of inner city schools can produce shock that some never completely overcome.

"Immobilized," "punitive in the classroom," "prejudiced toward all students from the lower-class and racial and ethnic groups," these descriptions are a part of the bleak montage of professional behavior found in literature on inner city schools. The fact is that not many teachers are being prepared for the realities of public school education in the deteriorating neighborhoods of large urban centers.

For example, until three years ago, 80 percent of the students in the Jersey City State College (JCSC) School of Education interned in white, middle-class, urban schools. The same percentage went on to teach in core city schools.

According to JCSC President William Maxwell, "We were training solid professionals; they obtained jobs, but there was no recognition of where the college was located, no sense of responsibility to Jersey City."

Admittedly, training teachers for easy adjustment to Jersey City public schools is no simple matter. The federal government lists Jersey City among the 10 most economically deprived U.S. cities. It has a large population of minorities living close to the poverty level.

Today, pre-service training in urban schools is mandated for all JCSC education programs, and the college has gone a step further. In 1977, in cooperation with the city's public school system, the college established the Alternative Teacher Training Program (ATTP), a five-semester, totally field-based, pre-service training program in the inner city elementary schools. The program was created by a team of JCSC faculty, staff and students, and faculty and staff from the public schools. The purpose of this collaborative effort is to "prepare skilled, responsible, and caring teachers for the urban milieu."

Related objectives are to strengthen

relations with the public schools and to revitalize a "motivated and caring" college education faculty that is nevertheless, remote from inner city life. The School of Education faculty is 98 percent tenured, primarily white, averages 12 years from retirement, and lives mainly–83 percent–in suburbia or the "nicer" urban neighborhoods.

The chief differences between ATTP and the college's traditional program are the amount of time students spend interning, the curricular emphasis on understanding the needs of inner city children, and the use of a variety of teaching strategies.

ATTP students spend their five semesters with several age groups of elementary school children from the city while those in the traditional program spend one semester with one age group. ATTP students begin as one-to-one reading tutors, move on to small group tutoring, and by the fourth semester they have almost total responsibility for their classrooms. The ATTP coursework applies theories of education specifically to the lives of inner city school children and provides ATTP students with an understanding of the historical, social, and economic environment in which the children must function.

ATTP students like the program and feel good about themselves. Being out on the front line, with daily opportunities to put theories to work, a strong group identity exists which tends to separate them from the traditional program students.

The program has earned praise from several sources. The Newman Commission, created by the state legislature to evaluate and revise teacher education, has been enthusiastic about ATTP and has used it as a basis for some of its recommendations. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), which funded the program, has cited it as an excellent model, and numerous colleges have sought assistance from JCSC in the preparation of similar programs.

The college intends the program to be small, but of high quality, and is committed to continue it without outside funding. ATTP enrollment the first year was 15; this year it is 10. The requirement of an extra semester and a heavy off-campus schedule that curtails campus life and limits part-time work opportunities will probably continue to keep enrollment low.

This year there are six college faculty in the program, bringing the total number that have been involved to 18. At the outset, JCSC faculty were apprehensive about working in the inner city schools. ATTP's

response to these concerns was to provide a non-threatening environment and an opportunity to become gradually acquainted with the problems of urban education. Now, current ATTP faculty as well as those who have left the program to return to traditional teaching duties are redirecting their orientation from suburban to urban education. These faculty are increasingly seeking out opportunities to supervise student interns in urban schools and to fashion workshops which address the unique difficulties of education in inner city schools.

ATTP hopes that its urban orientation will be contageous among the faculty in the School of Education. According to Janice Boone, Acting Dean of the School of Education, ATTP has already made a significant contribution to the school by highlighting the critical, but often neglected principle of putting educational theories into practice and seeing how they actually work.

Presently, there are three participating elementary schools in ATTP. The cooperating public school teachers feel that the relationship between JCSC and the school system has improved and that the increased presence of student teachers in the city's schools has meant greater credibility for the college in the community. The public school teachers who are a part of ATTP are beginning to see JCSC as a resource center and are frequently coming to the campus to seek advise on teaching techniques and curriculum. A few have been inspired to enroll in the college's masters degree program. However, ATTP has not yet been able to expand its influence beyond the participating schools to the district level of the Jersey City School System.

Large numbers or small, soft money or hard, there remains a sense that collaboration between the college and the school system has not yet reached its full potential and faces many challenges. One challenge is to balance the bureaucratic and manpower requirements of the public schools and the educational objectives of the college in the placement of ATTP student interns. Another pressing need is to sustain program commitment and cohesiveness in the face of small numbers of participating students and faculty.

Contact:
Mildred Goodwin
Coordinator, ATTP
Jersey City State College
Jersey City, New Jersey 07305
(201) 547-3387

Oklahoma City
EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM AT A CROSSROADS

Paul Little, who was among the conceptualizers of CECLL, Oklahoma City's community education consortium, talks about the three-year-old organization as being "in the process of becoming."

Whether that is a fact or a hope or a mix of both, the process so far has been marked by many of the problems that often beset even the best-intentioned institutional collaborators.

Little is director of extension services of the Metropolitan Library System. In 1976 the library system and South Oklahoma City Junior College, received a two-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to expand adult education in Oklahoma City. Credit courses were offered to low-income members of the community in a neighborhood library. When the FIPSE money ran out the project became the genesis of CECLL, the Community Education Consortium for Lifelong Learning.

At the time, Oklahoma City was ripe for community action and collaboration. Court-ordered school busing in the late 1960's had triggered a heavy migration to the suburbs that was draining the central city of its vitality and causing a drastic enrollment decline in the public schools. Moreover, the city was in a financial crunch and wanted joint civic projects that would trim operating costs.

To deal with this worsening situation, the city government established a broad-based community planning committee. Its task was to find ways to stem the migration, revitalize the central city, and attract more young families to live there. Next the city created an action committee, Central City Now, to implement the planning committee's ideas. The action committee proposed CECLL as an umbrella organization that would use underutilized public schools for an educational program that would improve the educational climate of the city.

The concept was sound: bring agencies and institutions together to share resources and facilities; offer programs that have wide appeal, ranging from college credit to job skills improvement to recreation and leisure time activities.

When CECLL was organized, the one thing it had plenty of was people. At the top, the board of directors was composed of representatives from each agency in the consortium. The responsibility for planning and implementing programs went to "administrative representatives," a group also composed of one member from each participating organization. To help meet its grass-roots objective, the city was parceled into 20 service areas. Their boundaries coincide with recognized neighborhoods where advisory committees, made up of neighborhood organizations, serve as communication links to the upper layers of CECLL. Staff work for CECLL is handled by an executive secretary loaned by the school district and housed in its offices.

Problems began popping up from the outset, and what followed could be useful to other communities planning similar consortia. It is generally agreed that CECLL's first error was its open door membership policy. With no formal criteria for admittance and no firm commitments attached to membership, the city's rich variety of agencies streamed in. Many were genuinely motivated, but some came simply to protect their turf, with no intention of actively participating.

The constant influx of new members meant that a lot of time had to be spent explaining CECLL to new members, getting them acquainted with each other, and trying to keep the CECLL identity and its original direction in tact. "At each board meeting we were reinventing the wheel," recalls Dudley Freeman, dean of Community Services at South Oklahoma Junior College.

As the organizational and planning period dragged into the second year, pressure built to get a trial program started. Something visible was needed quickly. Many CECLL members wanted to begin with traditional offerings in an affluent neighborhood where there would be an assured positive response. The reasoning was that traditional programs could be assembled faster than something innovative, and a successful beginning would be cost-effective and generate the organizational momentum to tackle the more challenging problems.

The idea was unacceptable to the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, the public schools, and numerous city agencies that had their own priorities. They wanted non-traditional programs for Hispanics, native American Indians, and the elderly in a neighborhood adjacent to downtown Oklahoma City which would complement their efforts to rejuvenate that part of the city. The compromise was to offer traditional programs early last year in both sections of the city.

When it became apparent that the programs in the poorer section of the city were not attracting a following, a number of reasons, were offered. One faction said CECLL's eyes were too big. It should have started small and expanded slowly. One CECLL official said poor lighting outside the high school where classes were held made people fear for their safety. Another faction argued that only non-traditional programs could have drawn a following in the non-affluent sector, and they should have been developed and offered at the outset. Perhaps closer to the mark was criticism that CECLL had not been vigorous enough in finding out through neighborhood organizations just what the educational needs of the residents were. The failure of the low-income neighborhood project caused disappointment and dissension among many persons who were dedicated to CECLL and to rebuilding the inner city.

In the fall of 1980, CECLL tried again; more than 100 courses were offered, but the classes drew only about 400 people.

There have been other issues and obstacles in launching CECLL, some obvious, some subtle, but all point out the pitfalls and complexities of interinstitutional cooperation.

Money: CECLL has no hard money of its own. Programs are financed from outside agencies or by the CECLL member offering the program. CECLL members are funded from different sources and have different spending policies that affect the amount of money that can be put into programs and its cost to the consumer.

Clientele: some members, such as the libraries and retired seniors volunteer program, serve the entire metropolitan area while others have a special interest in areas they are already serving. These differing concerns appear to get in the way of program decisions.

Business participation: while the Chamber of Commerce has a high level of interest in CECLL and a stake in its success, business and industry have stayed out of the program. There is an impression that, as far as CECLL is concerned, business and education are wary of each other, and the variances in their operating styles are a barrier to cooperation. The crisp, efficient style of planning and management that business prizes has been lacking in CECLL. One businessman said, "Community education partnerships is an idea whose time has come. We would like to see more business and professional people involved in the decision-making process."

Programmatic perceptions: there is a widely-held view that the CECLL programs are geared to high school students, since

most of the programs are sponsored by the school district. The feeling is that CECLL is mainly an extension of the Board of Education. The close connection of CECLL staff to the school district further reinforces the perception of public school dominance of the program. For example, CECLL news releases and other communications are issued on school district letterhead.

If CECLL is to "become," this will be a critical year in the process.

According to Dudley Freeman, participating agencies will be reviewed to determine their commitment and contribution to CECLL, and the membership will be reduced. Those remaining will be sorted into active members who can provide courses and staff, and associate members who can provide assistance, but not educational resources.

After a long educational period, participating members now see the need for a budget based on contributions from within the organization, reducing the reliance on soft money.

Contact:
Paul Little
Chief of Extension Services
Metropolitan Library System
131 Dean McGee Avenue
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
(405) 235-0571 ■

making connections

The Council for Interinstitutional Leadership is moving to Washington, D.C., on July 1, 1981. Although remaining a separate organization, it will now be affiliated with the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards. For further information contact: Lewis D. Patterson, Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, One Dupont Circle, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 833-4700.

Student Aid to the Urban Poor, a report to the Ford Foundation by the Washington Office of the College Board, concludes that the student aid system itself may be acting as a barrier to college enrollment by the urban poor. According to the College Board, many students simply give up when faced with a maze of confusing application forms, procedures, and deadlines; shifting regulations; and the short supply of expert counseling. The report calls for streaming the application process, improving information to students, and expanding counseling services. For more information contact: Janet S. Hansen, The College Board, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 404, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 332-7134.

Work and Training News is published monthly by the National Urban Coalition under a Department of Labor contract. The newsletter reports on employment and training issues and their impact on minorities, youth, women, and the poor in the urban community. For subscription information contact: National Urban Coalition, Work and Training News, Vicky Hula, Editor, 1201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 331-2400. ■

eric as a resource

The following reports and journal articles are drawn from the data base of the Educational Resource Information Clearinghouse on Higher Education, and have been announced in either of ERIC's two monthly publications, "Resources in Education" (RIE) or "Current Index to Journals in Education" (CIJE). RIE and CIJE are available for reference in college, public, and government libraries around the world. Most of the non-journal literature (those with "ED" numbers) is available in microfiche in over 800 library ERIC collections. Copies of many reports and journal articles can be obtained as well.

Baer, Walter S. *Strengthening University-Industry Interactions.* **Jan. 80, 34p. (ED 190 033) MF-$1.09**

While there is general agreement that stronger university-industry interactions are desirable and in the public interest, these interactions are only means to other ends. The promotion of industrial innovation is the goal of most immediate interest to government, but closer links can also support regional economic development, improve research and development results for government programs, and enhance national research efforts, as well as provide direct gains to universities and firms.

McKeefrey, William J. *Cooperative Arrangements; Between Private and Public Colleges. A Report on Current Practice and Recommendations for Policy.* **1978, 31p. (ED 180 387) MF-$1.09; PC-$5.05**

Cooperative arrangements between public and private higher education institutions are examined through a review of the relevant literature and survey of various campus programs.

A set of guidelines for state and national policy are offered concerning governance, student success, management efficiency, program quality, incentive systems, research, leadership, and information dissemination.

Rigolot, Carol, Ed. *Fiscal Issues in Higher Education.* **Oct. 78, 30p. (ED 187 246) MF-$1.09; PC-$5.05**

Forty colleges and life insurance presidents met to discuss key historical and contemporary factors influencing fiscal management in higher education, including inflation, salaries, diminishing enrollment figures, energy costs, federal regulations and the increasing cost of research. Differences and similarities between business and academia were outlined, and a program of mutual cooperation between both sectors was advocated.

Patterson, Lewis D., Ed. Ackely, H. Clayton, Ed. *Costing Collegiate Cooperation. A Report on the Costs and Benefits of Interinstitutional Programs with Consortium Case Studies and Guidelines.* **Oct. 79, 36p. (ED 180 340) MF-$1.09; PC-$5.05**

Voluntary interinstitutional cooperation is examined as a method of overcoming the financial constraints of retrenchment. Findings from 37 case studies on the costs and benefits of various cooperative programs are summarized. The programs reflect both the complexity and variety of interreliance that has evolved among American institutions. It is shown that voluntary interinstitutional cooperation, in addition to other advantages, is and can be cost effective.